



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on October 5, 2004, (Paper No. 20040924), the applicant elects the claim (1) of Group I with traverse. Portions of the restriction were improper as discussed below.

First, since the claims (6, 11 and 12) of Groups IV and VIII are in the same class and subclass as Group I, there would be no serious burden on the Examiner. (See MPEP 803.) Thus, claims 6, 11 and 12 should be examined for at least this reason.

Second, contrary to the position taken by the Examiner, the claims (2-6, 11 and 12) of Groups II-IV and VIII are all drawn to modifying a product specification, as is Group I. Thus, claims 2-6, 11 and 12 should be examined for at least this reason.

Finally, the claims (2-5) of Groups II and III, as amended, ultimately depend from claim 1 of Group I. Thus, claim 1 is a generic linking claim and if allowed, claims 2-5 should be rejoined to the application.

Respectfully submitted,

November 5, 2004

John C. Pokotylo, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,242
Tel.: (732) 542-9070